

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 13 and 19 are canceled, claims 1, 3, 12, 14, 18, 20 and 21 are amended, and claims 23-25 are added. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to express their appreciation to Examiner Ghee and Primary Examiner Wallerson for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview held on May 20, 2003. The discussion is incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Savitzky et al., (hereinafter Savitzky) U.S. Patent No. 6,012,083. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Savitzky fails to disclose or suggest selecting the appropriate printer driver in a computer for various printer destinations, as recited in claim 1.

Savitzky merely discloses the agency 10 interposed between one or more web clients and one or more web servers. That is, because agency 10 sends and receives HTTP document requests, it interacts with web clients and web servers which is only expected to be communicating with HTTP clients or servers (col. 5, lines 19-22). However, Applicants' invention specifies selecting the appropriate printer driver in a computer for various printer destinations. That is, the printer destinations are selected from an Internet print shop printer

or network printers, whereas Savitzky discloses selecting only the web clients and server printers.

Accordingly, Savitzky fails to disclose or suggest selecting the appropriate printer drivers in a computer for various printer destinations, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 12, 16-19 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568 to Tonkin. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tonkin fails to disclose or suggest the computer controlled by the modules selects the appropriate printer destination, as recited in claims 12 and 18.

Tonkin merely discloses terminals 31, 32 communicating with Internet service provider (ISPS) 41 through the Internet backbone 50 by the processing facility 60. The processing facility 60 retrieves document order messages sent over the Internet, processes those orders, and then distributes them to one of the various document production locations 71, 72, 73. That is, the processing facility 60 only processes the print order messages through the Internet, rather than selecting the appropriate printer driver with various printer destinations. Thus, Tonkin fails to disclose or suggest the computer controlled by the modules selects the appropriate printer destination, as recited in claims 12 and 18.

Because Savitzky and Tonkin fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, they cannot provide a basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Tonkin. Claims 4, 8 and 9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of Tonkin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,012,070 to Cheng et al. (hereinafter "Cheng"). Claim 11 is rejected as being unpatentable over Savitzky in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,085 to Bellucco et al. (hereinafter "Bellucco") and further in view of

Cheng. Claims 14 and 20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Tonkin in view of Bellucco. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Foremost, it is noted that claims 5 and 15 have not been rejected under the preceding paragraphs. However, it appears that the Examiner inadvertently failed to assert that claims 5 and 15 are rejected, since the Examiner addresses claim 5 on page 4 of the Office Action and addresses claim 15 on page 11 of the Office Action. Thus, Applicants addressed claims 5 and 15 as rejected on page 4 and 11 of the Office Action.

As discussed above, Savitzky and Tonkin neither disclose nor suggest the claimed invention of claims 1, 12 and 18, the independent claims from which the rejected claims depend. Thus, Cheng and Bellucco fail to overcome the noted deficiencies of Savitzky and Tonkin. Thus, it is respectfully requested the rejection be withdrawn.

For at least these reasons, Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or even suggest all of the features recited in claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-25. Thus, Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco fail to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-25. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-25 based on Savitzky, Tonkin, Cheng and Bellucco and the various asserted combination of these references are respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-12, 14-18 and 20-25 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

David J. Cho
Registration No. 48,078

JAO:DXC/ldg

Date: May 30, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037